

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 17 2006

POSZ LAW GROUP, PLC

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

12040 SOUTH LAKES DRIVE, SUITE 101
RESTON, VA 20191

SPECIALIZING IN PATENTS, TRADEMARKS & COPYRIGHTS

DAVID G. POSZ
JAMES E. BARLOW *
BRIAN C. ALTMILLER
ROBERT L. SCOTT, II
CYNTHIA K. NICHOLSON
R. EUGENE VARDELL JR.*
THERESE B. VARDELL*
KERRY S. CULPEPPER

DEBRA O. SHOEMAKER, PH.D.**

* NOT ADMITTED IN VIRGINIA
PRACTICE LIMITED TO FEDERAL PATENT,
TRADEMARK AND COPYRIGHT MATTERS
** PATENT AGENTTEL: (703) 707-9110
FAX: (703) 707-9112
WWW.POSZLAW.COMFACSIMILE TRANSMISSIONDate: 5/17/2006Pages: **25**

Fax No.: 571-273-8300

To: USPTO Office of Petitions

ATTENTION: Examining Attorney Charlema Grant

From: David Posz (Reg. No. 37,701)

Re: REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF PETITION UNDER
37 C.F.R. 1.181(a) FOR RE-MAILING OF NOTICE OF ALLOWANCE AND
RE-START OF ISSUE FEE DUE DATE (Serial No. 10/690,843)**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. 571-273-8300 on May 17, 2006 to the attention of Office of Petitions (Petitions Attorney Charlema R. Grant).

Typed Name: DAVID G. POSZ

Signature: 

Applicant(s): NATSUME et al.

Serial No.: 10/690,843

Filed: October 28, 2003

Title: DISTANCE CALCULATING
METHOD AND SYSTEM

Atty. Dkt.: 11-200

Group Art Unit: 3662

Examiner: Bernarr E. Gregory

****Notice****

The information contained in this facsimile transmission is intended only for the above-indicated addressee, and may contain privileged and confidential attorney work product or trade secret information. Any dissemination, distribution or copying of any part of this transmission is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission in error, please immediately notify the sender, and return the transmission to the sender at the above-indicated address.

CFC - RECEIVED = Sp.
MISSING = 22 p.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 17 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s): NATSUME et al.	Atty. Dkt.: 11-200
Serial No.: 10/690,843	Group Art Unit: 3662
Filed: October 28, 2003	Examiner: Bernarr E. Gregory
Title: DISTANCE CALCULATING METHOD AND SYSTEM	

Commissioner for Patents
Alexandria, VA 22314
Mail Stop: Petition

Date: May 17, 2006

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. 571-273-8300 on May 17, 2006 to the attention of Office of Petitions (Petitions Attorney Charlema R. Grant).

Typed Name: DAVID G. POSZ

Signature: **REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF PETITION UNDER
37 C.F.R. 1.181(a) FOR RE-MAILING OF NOTICE OF ALLOWANCE AND
RE-START OF ISSUE FEE DUE DATE**

Sir:

This Request is being timely filed in response to a DECISION ON PETITION mailed on May 11, 2006 by the USPTO that dismissed Applicants' PETITION UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.181(a) FOR RE-MAILING OF NOTICE OF ALLOWANCE AND RE-START OF ISSUE FEE DUE DATE filed on April 11, 2006 for the above application.

Upon review of the DECISION ON PETITION by the undersigned, it appears that the Office of Petitions asserts that the PETITION filed on April 11, 2006 was acceptable, except that the docketing records originally submitted with the PETITION as Exhibit A were allegedly

Serial No. 10/690,843

not sufficient to provide clarification of the firm's practice for docketing communications from the USPTO.

In response, attached hereto as Exhibit A please find copies of additional screens from the firm's docketing records for the present application in question. The first screen is the screen on which Office Action information was entered for the Office Action mailed on April 8, 2004 and on which filing date information was entered for the Amendment filed on June 29, 2004. The second screen is the screen on which the receipt date of the Notice of Allowance would have been entered, and on which the corresponding issue fee due date and issue fee payment date information would have been entered. As is evident from the latter screen, the Notice of Allowance date of receipt was never entered because the Notice was never received.

Also, referring back to Exhibit A of the April 11th PETITION, the Office should note that the docketing system enables the status of the present application as indicated on the upper

BEST AVAILABLE COPY